

In a widely quoted section of his letter, Professor Tribe assailed Dr. Siegan's support of the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling as "a component of the right to travel, a right long secured by the Federal courts," which was, of course, Dr. Siegan's reason for supporting *Brown v. Board of Education*.

At the time Professor Tribe claimed that this legal view was "tortured" and part of "Mr. Siegan's radical revisionism." At the conclusion of the letter, Professor Tribe wrote, "The notion that it is a black child's freedom to 'travel' onto the school grounds that segregation laws infringed is so bizarre and strained . . . as to bring into question both Mr. Siegan's competence as a constitutional lawyer and his sincerity as a scholar." This type of assault was typical of the attacks which preceded the defeat of Dr. Siegan's nomination. That was back in 1987. And much has changed since then.

By the time that Dr. Siegan died in March of 2006, he had many books and speeches and articles that made him one of the most prolific and respected legal and constitutional scholars on the political right. He is today credited with being a father of the recurrent rejuvenation of property rights theory in law.

In response to Dr. Siegan's defense of his views regarding *Brown v. Board of Education*, Tribe replied in a letter to Dr. Siegan's wife, and this was September 6, 1991: "I have reconsidered my description of your analysis of *Brown v. Board of Education* in footnote 10 on page 1379 of the second edition of *American Constitutional Law*. I agree with your general approach that *Brown* can be justified by arguing from the 'liberty' component of the 14th amendment . . ."

Now, that was a letter sent to Siegan years later by Dr. Tribe and when Dr. Tribe and Dr. Siegan were corresponding. These letters were found by his wife, Shelley. Tribe in that same letter writes: "Although I do not reach the same conclusions you do, the issues you raise are important enough to be worthy of scholarly discussion. I am now in the process of drafting a rather substantial supplement to my treatise summarizing recent developments in constitutional law. In my discussion of the equal protection clause, I will include a citation to your book that I am sure will please you more than the citation did in the last book."

□ 2245

Unfortunately for the public reputation of Dr. Siegan, Professor Tribe never did complete the supplement to his treatise, and Dr. Siegan, of course, passed away after that exchange of letters.

Mrs. Siegan wrote to Professor Tribe after discovering these letters and asked Dr. Tribe for information on the planned, but not completed, supplement. She also asked the following question: "In the 19 years since you penned your letter to JOE BIDEN, I won-

der if you have reconsidered your comment regarding Bernie's competence as a constitutional lawyer and a serious scholar?" Tribe replied to Mrs. Siegan on September 21, 2006. "Please permit me," he wrote, "to apologize to you here for the unnecessarily ad hominem character of what I wrote to Senator BIDEN in May of 1987. To help correct the record, if only posthumously, I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator BIDEN. Despite the differences in our perspectives," he said, "I came to think of Bernie, just as you write that he thought of me, as a colleague in the profession we both truly love and consider to be one of the noblest."

I would submit the rest of this statement for the RECORD and note that Lawrence Tribe has set the Record straight, and now the Record is straight on the great person and great scholar that Dr. Bernard Siegan was.

I am sorry to have caused him, or you, any distress, and am grateful for the opportunity your letter afforded me to set the record straight as best I could at this late date.

Mr. Speaker, the correspondence between Professors Bernard Siegan and Lawrence Tribe and the subsequent correspondence between Shelly Siegan and Professor Tribe tell us much about the ugly period of personal attack this country experienced during the judicial nomination hearings of the 1980s.

A review of the above cited letters makes it clear that Professor Bernard Siegan was a distinguished and respected scholar and champion of personal liberty and private property. Contrary to assertions made during his nomination hearings in 1987, Professor Bernard Siegan would have made an excellent addition to the Ninth District Circuit Court of Appeals. And now the record is set straight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### U.S. TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the United States has just announced the

second highest monthly trade deficit for this year, \$60 billion. That is just in the month of May. Our Nation continues to import more goods and services than we export at alarming rates, with a record \$192 billion more coming into this country in the earlier part of this year than going out.

This particular chart shows the top category of concern, imported petroleum, which has continued to rise, including in this Presidential administration, despite President Bush's statement at the beginning of his administration that we have a serious problem. America is addicted to oil, which is being imported from some of the most unstable parts of the world. He said that, and yet he continued to allow the import of more petroleum.

Americans are watching as our government does nothing to curb these growing trade deficits, with their accompanying job losses, deteriorating labor conditions and community washouts that U.S. trade policy leaves in its wake.

A bill I have sponsored, H.R. 169, the Balancing Trade Act of 2007, requires the President, if over 3 consecutive calendar years the United States has a trade deficit with another country that totals over \$10 billion, to take the necessary steps to create a trading relationship that would eliminate or substantially reduce that trade deficit by entering into better agreements with that country. In other words, if the United States runs a substantial deficit with any one country, the President must report back to Congress on his plans for correcting that imbalance. This is a very constructive first step to correct the path of U.S. trade policy which is yielding this red ink.

Our bill calls attention to those countries who are taking advantage of our willingness to import goods from them while they block our access to their markets. Our two largest deficits in 2006, for example, were first with China. This is a country we have amassed a \$232.5 billion deficit. That is an enormous amount, comprising about a quarter of what we have amassed with all countries in the world. And the deficit with China has just grown at alarming proportions.

The next largest deficit is with Japan. That has been a lingering deficit that has been growing over the years. It now totals about one-third of what we accumulate with China; it's about \$88.4 billion. And every billion in deficit equals a loss of between 10,000 and 20,000 jobs in this country. That is a displacement in production in this country, putting it someplace else.

Now, these deficits have persisted for years, which makes them particularly troublesome. This chart illustrates our deficit with China pre and post what is called "normal trade relations" with China. We had a very bad deficit already back in the late 1990s, but with the adoption of permanent trade relations with China, that deficit has more than doubled.